UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,914	02/25/2004	Akira Nakano	9281-4793	2084
	7590 12/09/201 ER GILSON & LIONE	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 1039		ALEJANDRO MULERO, LUZ L		
CHICAGO, IL	00010		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1716	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/09/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/786,914	NAKANO ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Luz L. Alejandro	1716		

	Luz L. Alejandro	1716	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 24 November 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS			
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar it, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3 months from the mailing date</u>	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Anno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cause
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor			oadoo
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		,.	
(c) 🛛 They are not deemed to place the application in beti	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
appeal; and/or	anna an an allan an annah an af fin all an air		
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c		ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	* **	manliant Amandmant/	OTOL 224)
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (i	FIOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timaly filad amandman	et cancaling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owable ii subifilited iii a separate,	umely filed amendmen	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an ex	oplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-23</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>24</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	I sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application ir	n condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Luz L. Alejandro/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Jnit 1716	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the amendment to the claims raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the references do not disclose the chamber wall of the chamber and the susceptor electrode being AC shorted to each other by a plurality of metal plates since the mere disclosure of "a metal element" in the secondary references does not teach or suggest "a plurality of metal plates". The examiner respectfully points out that regarding the metal elements being metal plates, a prima facie case of obviousness exists because the particular shape of the metal elements is a matter of choice which a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious absent persuasive evidence that the particular configuration of the claimed metal element is significant. Note that arguments of counsel cannot take the place of evidence in the record. Additionally, the examiner respectfully contends that the specification of the instant application, in col. 6-line 25, appears to disclose that the metal plates (not the ends) are elastic springs. Therefore, the shape of the bellows of Kawakami et al. and Kagastsume et al. and especially the coils disclosed by the Sakai et al. references, respectively, would not result in a structure with the opposite effect of Applicant's claimed structure. Even more, the coils of the Sakai et al. reference would have a similar shape as the elastic rings disclosed by the applicant in the specification.